

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed September 12, 2006, in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-13 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify features of the claimed lighting apparatus. The amendments to claim 1 are fully supported by applicant's disclosure, see for example, Specification, page 6, lines 8-21, and Figure 2.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kang, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0057841. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a rear mirror is provided fixed to the bulb of the lighting apparatus such that light emitted by the bulb to a rear side of the bulb is reflected toward the front side of the lighting apparatus, thus improving lighting efficiency, and further, since the rear mirror is integrally fixed to the bulb's stem and rotatable together with the bulb when the bulb is rotated, the reflecting area of the rear mirror can be reduced while improving overall efficiency of the lighting apparatus.

For at least the following reasons, the recitations of claim 1 are neither anticipated by nor obvious based on the cited art. By way of example, claim 1 requires a lighting apparatus that includes a reflector fixed to an outer surface of the casing, and a rear mirror integrally fixed to the bulb stem and integrally rotatable together with the bulb when the bulb is rotated, for forwardly reflecting light rearwardly emitted from the bulb.

Kang discloses an electrodeless discharge lamp that includes a bulb with a reflective portion 154, a magnetron 104, a waveguide 106, a resonator 120 and a bulb portion 132. The Examiner alleges that the reflective portion 134 "extended integrally from the rear side of the bulb portion 132" (Kang, page 3, paragraph 52) corresponds to a rear mirror.

Claim 1 requires both a reflector fixed to an outer surface of the casing, and a rear mirror integrally fixed to the bulb stem. First, Kang does not disclose or suggest a rear mirror, as *inter*

alia required by claim 1. The reflective portion 134 of Kang corresponds to some sort of reflector. Kang discloses that the reflective portion 132 is disposed inside the resonator to reduce total size of the electrodeless discharge lamp. Therefore, Kang does not disclose or suggest a rear mirror integrally fixed to the bulb stem. In a similar vein, it would require some sort of double counting of the reflective portion 134 of Kang to meet both the reflector fixed to an outer surface of the casing and the rear mirror integrally fixed to the bulb stem required by claim 1.

Further, since Kang does not disclose or suggest a rear mirror integrally fixed to the bulb stem, Kang is incapable of disclosing or suggesting a rear mirror integrally rotatable together with the bulb when the bulb is rotated, as further required by claim 1. Accordingly, Kang does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and are thus patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based on Kang in view of Levin et al., WO 98/53475. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kang does not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of claim 4 (Office Action, page 3). However, the Examiner alleges that Levin combined with Kang discloses all of the features of claim 4.

Kang is cited as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Kang is assigned to LG Electronics Inc., and the present application is assigned to the same entity. Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Kang cannot be cited in an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) against the present application.

Further, Levin does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kang as they relate to the above-identified features of claim 1. The Examiner does not allege that Levin discloses or suggests such features of claim 1. Therefore, since claim 4 depends from independent claim 1, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 5-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based on Kang in view of Turner et al., WO 97/27617. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

First, as discussed, Kang cannot be cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 against the present application. Further, Turner does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kang as they relate to claim 1. Therefore, since claims 5-13 depend from claim 1, they are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Amendment or regarding the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-provided telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Max Moskowitz
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM/GB:lac:ns